

DEC 22 2004

PATENT RESPONSE

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application No.: 09/683,921  
Filing Date: March 1, 2002  
Inventor: Timothy P. Goggins  
Title: Lenticular Bar Code Image  
Examiner: Kurniko C. Koyama  
Art Unit: 2876  
Attorney Docket: NG-31336 (07845.0032)  
Confirmation No.: 3798  
Customer No.: 022202

**CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a) and 1.10**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

**Mailing**

☐ deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ with sufficient postage as first class mail

☐ as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No.

**Transmission**

☒ transmitted by facsimile to Fax No. (703) 872-9306 addressed to Examiner Koyama at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Date:

*December 22, 2004**Rosen Strong*

Mail Stop RCE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

Introductory Comments begin on:	page 2 of 22
Amended Claims begin on:	page 3 of 22
Remarks begin on:	page 12 of 22
Conclusion begins on:	page 21 of 22
Extension of Time begins on:	page 22 of 22

Application No. 09/683,921

PATENT RESPONSE

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

After careful review, Applicant hereby responds to a September 22, 2004, Final Office Action regarding the above-referenced patent application. In view of this Response, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of said application.

Applicant has not added new matter with this Response and intends the scope of the invention and previously pending claims to be the same before and after this Response. Indeed, Applicant only offers this Response to clarify the invention for the Examiner and to assist the Examiner's understanding of the same. More specifically, Applicant has not intended this Response to effectuate a narrowing of the claims, foreclose techniques that are not reasonably foreseeable at this time, or effect the applicability and scope of the Doctrine of Equivalents.